

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORKUSDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #: 12/11/2020
DATE FILED: 12/11/2020

-----X
:
MARTIN JOHN STEVENS, :
:
Plaintiff, :
:
-v- : 20-CV-8181 (JPC)
:
ALAN J. HANKE et al., :
:
Defendants. :
:
-----X

JOHN P. CRONAN, United States District Judge:

The Court is in receipt of (1) a letter-motion from Defendant Sidney Mills Rogers III, requesting a conference to discuss his anticipated Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 47); (2) a letter from Plaintiff consenting to stay the briefing schedule for Defendant Amy Roy-Haeger's anticipated Motion to Dismiss pending the resolution of her Motion to Dismiss in *Thani A.T. Al Thani v. Hanke et al.*, 20-cv-04765 (the "Related Case") (Dkt. 48); (3) a letter from Defendants Alan J. Hanke and IOLO Global LLC contesting Plaintiff's November 23, 2020 letter, in which Plaintiff stated that he did not agree to stay discovery in this case (*see* Dkt. 37), and seeking (i) to withdraw their request to stay discovery and (ii) to set a time to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint (Dkt. 49); and (4) Plaintiff's response to that letter (Dkt. 50).

It is hereby ORDERED that the briefing schedule for Defendants Hanke and IOLO Global LLC's Motion to Stay Discovery (Dkt. 39) is ADJOURNED *sine die*. It is further ORDERED that Defendants Hanke and IOLO Global LLC's request for the Court to set a time to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint, which would require vacating the Court's previous Order granting a request from those very Defendants to stay their time to answer the Complaint (*see* Dkts.

33, 34), is DENIED.

In addition, in order to avoid unnecessary expenditure of the Court's and the parties' resources, the Court finds good cause to stay the date by which all Defendants must respond to the Complaint until fourteen days after entry of the Court's decision(s) on the parallel Motions to Dismiss filed in the Related Case. (Dkt. 34.) The Court emphasizes that, regardless of whether a Defendant prevails on its Motion to Dismiss in the Related case, each Defendant must answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint in this case. The Court further emphasizes that it will not allow parties to relitigate identical arguments raised in a Motion to Dismiss filed in this case if those arguments have been made by a Defendant and rejected in the Related Case.

In light of this Order, Defendant Roy-Haeger need not submit a letter response to the Court's December 4, 2020 Order (Dkt. 44), requiring that she specify whether she consents to a stay of the briefing schedule on her Motion to Dismiss pending the resolution of her motion in the Related Case.

The Clerk of the Court is respectfully directed to terminate the motions pending at document numbers 47 and 49.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 11, 2020
New York, New York



JOHN P. CRONAN
United States District Judge